

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

13th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XIII, Number 8

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

May 1, 1983

New Budget Necessitates Big Cuts, NIH Says

The National Institutes of Health has drawn up a stunning retrenchment program to conform to the austere and tardy budget that the Administration has finally decided for the great biomedical-research enterprise for the fiscal year that starts next October 1.

But before orders are placed for pink slips and padlocks, it is worth noting that some seasoned watchers of budget strife detect a semblance of the legendary Washington Monument ploy in Bethesda's doomsday plans. The reference is to the Interior Department, custodian of the edifice, allegedly responding to a budget trim by

plan for hardtimes that calls for terminating support for 51 of 320 specialized and comprehensive research centers, for a saving of \$39.5 million. It would cut out 81 research projects and programs, for a saving of \$13.7 million. And 890 training awards, totaling \$9.7 million, would be eliminated.

On top of that, the appropriations committees were informed, NIH would renegotiate existing grants downward by about six percent, and "It would also be necessary to negotiate competing research project grants downward by approximately 10 percent from study section recommended levels."

The cuts and financial shifts would provide support for a goal of 5000 new and competing grants, and thereby raise the total of research project grants to a record high of 16,560. However, there would be a drop of nearly 10 percent in the number of trainees being supported, to a total of 9076.

What's ironic about the fixation on 5000 grants is
(Continued on page 2)

Defense R&D Chief Sees Cozy Ties With Academe—Page 3

announcing unthinkable plans to close the Monument over a July 4th weekend. As the tale goes, Congress rushed in with financial aid—and there are signs that a similar process of relief awaits the NIH.

The drama is being played late in the Congressional budget cycle because the Administration had not yet settled on a sum for NIH when the fiscal 1984 budget was sent to Congress at the end of January. In that budget, Richard Schweiker, a longtime NIH booster who was then Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, wanted to add at least \$150 million to the \$4 billion that Congress had appropriated for NIH at the end of December. But the Office of Management and Budget, protesting that last year Congress had voted far more than the President had sought, insisted on less. The budget for NIH was marked "draft," and was submitted to Congress with the understanding that a final version would soon be along.

While the matter was being argued, Schweiker left office, and, with a clear field, OMB prevailed. In mid-March, just prior to the commencement of NIH's lengthy annual series of appropriations hearings, OMB decreed a mere \$77 million increase for next year. Along with that, it directed NIH to reprogram its funds so as to support 5000 new and continuing grants in FY 1984, roughly the same as this year. It also mandated a reduction in indirect costs that would amount to about \$72 million, thus repeating an action that Congress, heavily lobbied by the major research universities, overrode last year.

With a budget increase that falls short of biomedical inflation, the NIH management responded by submitting to its Congressional appropriations committees a

In Brief

A survey of legislative assistants responsible for looking after health-related issues for members of the House and Senate found that only two percent had professional training in health or science. Also handling other duties, they averaged 10 hours a week on those two subjects, but spent only two hours conferring about them with their bosses. The survey, covering 512 House and Senate assistants, was conducted by a Washington consulting firm, Grupenhoff and Endicott, and reported in the *Mt. Sinai Journal of Medicine*.

There's been a limp reception so far for the National Academy of Sciences' study of International Competition in Advanced Technology, a year in the works, budgeted for \$350,000, and much-touted by NAS brass as a landmark contribution to wise policymaking on keeping the US strong in high-tech industry. Its vaporous recommendations drew yawns from puzzled Senators when it was unveiled before the Senate Finance Committee April 14. The Washington Post described the members as "distinctly underwhelmed," while the New York Times reported "they complained it was too general to serve as a blueprint for action." (69 pages, \$9.50 per copy, NAS Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20418.)

How NIH Plans to Distribute the Pain

(Dollars in thousands)

	1982 Actual		1983 Estimate		1984 Estimate		Change	
	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount
Research Grants								
Research Projects:								
Noncompeting projects	10,943	\$1,251,463	11,443	\$1,443,769	11,560	\$1,510,790	117	\$67,021
Administrative supplements	(471)	16,784	(577)	15,396	(297)	7,814	(-280)	-7,572
Competing projects	5,027	564,640	4,914	595,412	5,000	623,146	86	27,734
Subtotal, research projects	15,970	1,832,887	16,357	2,054,577	16,560	2,141,750	203	87,173
Research Centers:								
Specialized/comprehensive ctrs	316	244,048	320	260,879	269	221,350	-51	-39,529
General clinical research ctrs	75	63,778	74	74,023	74	78,812	—	4,789
Biotechnology resource grants	41	15,327	43	20,410	43	21,710	—	1,300
Lab. animal sciences and primate res	47	24,259	44	25,460	44	27,370	—	1,910
Gorgas memorial institute	1	1,692	1	1,800	—	—	-1	-1,800
Subtotal, research centers	480	349,104	482	382,572	430	349,242	-52	-33,330
Other Research:								
Research career programs	1,236	50,736	1,265	55,670	1,250	57,586	-15	1,916
Cancer task forces	136	13,945	110	11,710	110	12,000	—	290
Clinical education programs	75	4,614	84	6,000	79	6,000	-5	—
Cooperative clinical research	237	43,832	245	44,319	235	46,942	-10	2,623
Biomedical research support	548	49,395	542	59,893	460	38,530	-82	-21,363
Minority biomedical support	76	23,834	68	26,376	68	27,624	—	1,248
Other research related	305	22,870	262	24,649	293	26,196	31	1,547
Subtotal, other research	2,613	209,226	2,576	228,617	2,495	214,878	-81	-13,739
Total, Research Grants	19,063	2,391,217	19,415	2,665,766	19,485	2,705,870	70	40,104
Training								
Individual awards	1,539	27,067	1,455	28,169	1,344	26,387	-111	-1,782
Institutional awards	8,867	123,426	8,514	139,269	7,732	131,278	-782	-7,991
Total, Training	10,406	150,493	9,969	167,438	9,076	157,665	-893	-9,773
Research and Development Contracts	1,209	316,228	1,094	316,135	1,052	316,200	42	65
Intramural Research		455,605		497,319		521,951		24,632
Direct Operations		148,343		163,609		171,634		8,025
Program Management		39,753		44,650		45,386		736
Disease Control		55,192		56,000		60,040		4,040
Construction Grants		6,493		3,000		2,110		-890
Subtotal, IRD's		3,563,324		3,913,917		3,980,856		66,939
National Library of Medicine		45,035		47,114		49,616		2,502
Office of the Director		23,618		25,748		26,720		972
Buildings and Facilities		9,898		17,500		19,900		2,400
TOTAL, NIH	3,641,875		4,004,279		4,077,092		72,813	

* FFTP—Full-time equivalent training positions.

† Reflects absorption and transfer for pay costs (\$2,299).

NIH

(Continued from page 1)

that the NIH management settled upon it during the Carter Administration as a means of stabilizing project support—not as a goal for which all else should be sacrificed. The figure, however, has taken on a magic significance in Congress and in OMB, with both apparently sharing the belief that all's well at NIH if it can finance the cherished 5000. NIH Director James B. Wyngaarden has suggested a rethinking of the now-sacred "stabilization" strategy, but, as he has publicly noted, it has an easily understandable quality that is appealing to the laymen who determine NIH's budget fate.

Having spelled out the reductions that it will make if parsimony prevails, NIH must now await the verdict of

the Congress. The signs are that, as so often in the past, it will be a generous verdict. At the institute-by-institute appropriations hearings that have been running since late March, members have been expressing dismay at the prospect of paltry growth in the NIH budget. Last year, when Reagan was riding high in suppressing growth in domestic spending, the Congress raised the NIH budget by \$361 million, rather than the \$107 million proposed by the Administration. Among the health-research lobbyists clustered around NIH, the talk is of a need for a minimum growth of \$400 million in next year's budget. That would be a 10 percent increase, modest in comparison to the gains of the go-go days, but politically not at all out of the question, even in these difficult times.—DSG

Good Links Reported Between DoD, Universities

Academe and the military are getting along very well these days, with the main shortcoming being an insufficient bundle of Pentagon research money for university applicants, according to Richard D. DeLauer, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering.

In testimony April 22 before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Research and Development, DeLauer indicated there has been a lot of progress in DoD's efforts to undo the damage that the Vietnam war did to its ties with the major research universities. Reporting on the first year of DoD's \$30-million program to provide research equipment for universities, DeLauer said it drew some 2500 applications from which it was able to make only 201 awards. The total sought by the applicants, he said, amounted over \$600 million.

DeLauer credited the DoD-University Forum—which he co-chairs with Donald Kennedy, President of Stanford University—with easing many tensions between the Pentagon and universities. The universities, he said, were “particularly upset about the technology-transfer issue, the whole question of classified research on the campus, of the need for prior review before publishing....After a year and a half,” he said, “we’re not arguing about those broad things anymore. We’re arguing about the fact that we [the universities] want more. Why can’t we have more?

“It isn’t a question that we don’t want to have anything to do with you,” DeLauer continued, adding, “Part of it had to do with the depression out there, the fact that other elements of funding had slowed down. And it’s surprising how many converts that makes. We’ve had a lot of success in getting people who in the past were very reluctant—the University of Wisconsin, remember all the problems we had there? They’re part of this whole process on [a DoD survey of national security needs in] languages. The University of Wisconsin and the NSA [National Security Agency] are now working on a very low-key mathematics program together. Not necessarily funding, but in cryptography...they’ve got an arrangement for the review of papers. The universities send their papers in a week or

Security Plan Proposed

A recommendation for limited and carefully applied restrictions on several areas of militarily relevant research in universities has been endorsed by the DoD-University Forum.

The Forum is essentially a twice-a-year bull session between DoD’s research managers and the big research universities, and its recommendations are only another drop in the intra-Administration contention over so-called export controls. But the Forum, co-chaired by Donald Kennedy, President of Stanford University, and Richard DeLauer, the Pentagon’s top research chief, is a creation of the anti-zealot camp in the fighting over controls. Its position, therefore, can be taken as reflecting a realistic assessment of the minimal intrusion that academe can insist upon in this hardline Administration.

The recommendation, adopted at a Forum meeting April 19, was composed by a working party co-chaired by Edith Martin, DoD Deputy Under Secretary for Research and Advanced Technology, and David A. Wilson, Executive Assistant to the President of the University of California. Its starting point, previously endorsed by the Forum, was the

(Continued on page 4)

so before they’re to be published, not for...approval but it’s an information thing and if there are some problems, NSA gets back to them and they work it out without any big headlines and without complaining that there’s an attempt at censorship.”

Continuing with his account of better relations with universities, DeLauer said, “I think the attitude is much better. Now the other thing,” he said, “is that we’re making a big effort. The whole super computer programs that we’re now proposing, I’ll tell you that even [President] Josh Lederberg, up in Rockefeller University, which is primarily a med school, he’s a member of the Defense Science Board, and he says, ‘I want to get a part of that computer business. We’ll put a team together and get to work on it.’”

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1983

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Margaret E. Lee

Contributing Correspondents

Christopher Joyce, Kim A. McDonald (Washington); Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except in January, July & August. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$132.50 (two years, \$235.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

France: Industry on Top in Research Shuffle

Paris. The research system in France is so centralized and controlled by the government that R&D inevitably feels effects from political turbulence. It was feeling them quite strongly last month from the combination of a slumping economy and municipal elections that signified dissatisfaction with the grand designs of the Mitterrand regime.

The President responded with a reshuffle of policies and ministers that provided a good deal of bewilderment for the general public and especially for this country's politically sensitive scientific community. First, Mr. Mitterrand retained many of his senior ministers, but directed them to reverse course on basic economic and social matters.

Not among them, however, was his flamboyant Minister for Research and Industry, Jean-Pierre Chevenement, the architect of what has been widely publicized as the master plan for a great renaissance of French science, technology, and advanced industry. To the puzzlement of the scientific community, which shared in the impression of a bright political future for Chevenement, the Minister was out, replaced by a political rival, Laurent Fabius, who had been Minister of the Budget.

Whether Chevenement, leader of the leftist wing of the Socialist Party, departed voluntarily or was forced out is a matter of some contention, but he left behind a good deal of wonder concerning what political indiscretions he might have committed to be the only one among his colleagues to arouse the ire of the President.

For the first year of the Mitterrand government, which took office in June 1981, Chevenement served as Minister of Research and Technology. In that post, he

strongly espoused, with Mitterrand's enthusiastic approval, massive budget increases for research and development, as well as the introduction of new blood into the aging leadership of science and technology.

Last July, his political fortunes appeared brighter than ever when he was assigned to add the powerful Ministry of Industry to his domain. Chevenement assured the scientific community of his continuing interest by emphasizing that his new domain would be named the Ministry of Research and Industry—reversing the order of a previous combination of the two. He particularly insisted that the promised increase of support for science and technology would not be sacrificed to the needs of industry. These assurances calmed scientists' fears that the Mitterrand government would emulate its predecessors' unfulfilled promises of a scientific boom. The fact is, though, that while the plans for growth remained intact, funding remained fairly sluggish.

While the scientific community retained its confidence in Chevenement's good intentions, industry responded with a good deal of anxiety and, eventually, opposition to his interventionist schemes. In February, a generous portion of the leadership of French industry went to the Elysee to demand the head of the Minister of Research and Industry. And it was handed over.

Thus, Chevenement, the left wing Socialist interventionist who had been close to the Communists, is gone. Replacing him is the youngest of the ministers and the one most faithful to Mitterrand's outlook. Elegant and efficient, with degrees in literature and administration,

(Continued on page 5)

DoD-University

(Continued from page 3)

National Academy of Sciences' report on *Scientific Communication and National Security* (SGR Vol. XII, No. 17), which concluded that universities account for very little leakage of technological data of national security value.

Stressing the toll that security restrictions may exact from scientific productivity, the paper endorsed by the Forum said that in academe and elsewhere it had found "agreement that a reasonable approach can be developed to deal with restrictions needed to delay the transfer of that small set of truly critical technologies that is being developed in university settings."

Specifically, it suggested that DoD set up and support a "technology committee" that would identify unclassified but "sensitive" fields of research (which it identifies as mainly in microelectronics, cryp-

tology, and computer software). Federal contract and grant officers would be instructed to notify applicants for support about these sensitive areas, and, it would be agreed beforehand that if the work "is deemed 'sensitive,' then it would be subject to controls such as" barring participation by designated foreign nationals. In addition, researchers would agree to a 60-day prepublication review of papers on sensitive subjects, but "The right and responsibility for publication rests with the university or the principal investigator" regardless of the outcome of the review.

In other times, these recommendations for trimming academe's traditions of free association and unfettered publication would have aroused a storm. But, given the mean spirit and lust for secrecy rampant among the Administration's hawks, the Forum's concessions are minor in comparison to the designs of the hardliners.

...New Minister Reaffirms Growth for R&D

(Continued from page 4)

Fabius has had a brilliant and flawless career. As Minister of the Budget from the very start of the present Administration, he rapidly gained the confidence of industrial and financial leaders.

Fabius' first public statement was well received. He said that industry must protect its autonomy—a line that led Yvon Gattaz, the leader of private industry, to cheerfully state in public that "contrary to what is being said, I did not write Minister Fabius' speech." Perhaps even more significant, Fabius' public debut in his new ministerial role was at the opening of the Hall of Innovation, a center promoting high-tech business enterprises. "I will be the Minister of Innovation," he said. More important, the ministry reverted to its old title, Industry and Research.

Chevenement had assigned a high priority to the expansion of the national research enterprise, and had plans for a State Bank that would specialize in providing venture capital for technologically adventurous enterprises. The plan, slightly megalomaniac, in the Chevenement style, was discreetly torpedoed by the Minister of Economy. Another Chevenement special called for a series of great national projects that would mobilize researchers and industry to work on high-tech products.

Electronics and data processing had been chosen to start, and 14 projects were proposed during last summer. These projects, including automatic translation, computer-aided design, software engineering, and a grand computer for military use, were the object of many meetings and many words, but not a single franc was spent. The overall venture was supposed to be a focus for emulating the Japanese style of public and private collaboration in research. Instead, it acquired a reputation as an academic club, and eventually industry pulled out.

As time went by, the French patent position in electronics and other high-technology sectors was seen to be declining. The British have twice as many patents as the French; the Germans three times as many; the Ameri-

Physics Today Names Wash. Editor

Irwin Goodwin, a former *Newsweek* correspondent and writer and editor for the National Academy of Sciences, has been appointed to the newly created post of Washington editor of *Physics Today*, monthly magazine of the American Institute of Physics. He will cover scientific and political news of interest to the Institute, which embraces nine professional societies concerned with research and education. Goodwin's office is at 2100 Pennsylvania Ave. Nw., Suite 739, Washington, DC 20037; tel. 202/429-1946.

Keyworth Cites Useless R&D

The following excerpts are from an address, "Revitalizing the American Economy: The Essential Role of Basic Research," by George A. Keyworth, presidential Science Adviser, April 18 to the annual meeting of the American Physical Society, in Baltimore.

...there are still institutions claiming a large portion of...federal R&D resources that don't contribute significantly to training scientific personnel, don't contribute significantly to improving productivity, and don't contribute significantly to improving national defense. And in some cases...they aren't particularly at the forefront of scientific research, either....I know many of the institutions involved feel quite comfortable following and protecting their outdated agenda....

Our world leadership in high-energy physics has been dissipated. In the years American physicists squandered on a pork-barrel squabble, the Europeans moved boldly ahead....We really have no choice but to strive to regain that leadership....This has to be a time for statesmanship, not for pet projects.

cans six times, and the Japanese 15 times. This situation is certainly no credit to the scientific community or French technology, but it is nothing new, and it is not the result of the two years of Socialist government.

Still, there was a lot of ill feeling toward Chevenement on the part of the pragmatists. Fabius will have a lot to do if he wants to improve the image of the organization he is heading. It appears that his strategy for research is to let things follow their own course. He has solemnly reaffirmed the Government's intention to devote 2.5 percent of the French GNP to R&D in 1985.

On the industrial side, the large nationalized companies are expected to speed their modernization. Fabius also hopes that from now to 1990 small industry will also develop with new technology and create one million new jobs. (This is really a dream if one compares it to the numbers forecast by the US Department of Labor, which foresees that many jobs being created for the whole of the US.) He has announced new measures to encourage the transformation of R&D results into industrial activity. But he has not yet adopted the slogan which the industrial leader Yvon Gattaz directed towards the new Minister when he was appointed: "More orders rather than subsidies."—FS

NSF Chief Grilled at Senate Confirmation

Edward A. Knapp's nomination as Director of the National Science Foundation was easily approved in committee and on the floor of the Senate last month, but only after Senator Edward Kennedy badgered him at length about Knapp's celebrated ouster of several senior NSF aides last November (SGR Vol. XII, No. 21).

The hearing, before the Labor and Human Resources Committee, was long in coming only because of a clogged Congressional schedule, but the delay served the purpose of tempering the indignation that raged last fall when Knapp lopped a few heads upon taking office under an interim appointment. Kennedy, who has long maintained an interest in NSF affairs, quoted from press accounts that alleged a "politicization" of the Foundation, and drew from Knapp a series of assurances that the episode was overblown and misinterpreted.

Expressing concern about reports that a "political litmus test" will be used for filling senior positions at the Foundation, Kennedy asked Knapp to assure him that it wasn't so. Knapp, who is said to be chagrined about the awkwardness of his debut on the Washington scene, leapt at the invitation.

Picking a Deputy Director

"That will not be the case," he quickly responded. And he went on to describe the pristine process of selection now underway to recruit a Deputy Director and three Assistant Directors for NSF. He and the non-partisan National Science Board—the policymaking body for the Foundation—have worked up a list of candidates for the Deputy post, and have forwarded it to the White House.

"In the production of that list of nominees," he assured Kennedy, "the sole criterion...was managerial and scientific skill. There has not been a political test at all."

Though he, of course, knew the answer, Kennedy then asked, "Why should the White House be in this particular area?"

"They're presidential appointments," Knapp replied, adding that Harry Truman had vetoed a legislative charter that would have given the appointment power to the Science Board.

Kennedy, obviously for the purpose of letting Knapp know that he would be under observation, then returned to last fall's ousters, asking, "How do you respond to these reports of a purge at NSF?" And he also asked Knapp to respond to a wild-eyed report that the White House okayed a big budget boost for NSF in return for the alleged purge of

Carter holdovers.

Knapp then recited what he's been saying for months—that he wanted his own choices in the senior positions.

Kennedy responded that Knapp had engaged in a "clear departure" from precedent.

"It isn't a complete departure," Knapp said with a touch of annoyance. "I've been told," he said, "that there has been a turnover [in the past] at the time of a new Director, perhaps not as much, but there has been turnover before."

Kennedy then returned to the allegations about the vacancies and the budget.

"I don't think there's any connection at all," Knapp replied. "There was no requirement that any people be removed in order to get budget increases."

Citing well-founded reports of political tests being applied to science-advisory appointments in the Interior Department and other government agencies, Kennedy drove on, demanding still further assurances that NSF would be kept pure.

"No Political Tests?"

"The National Science Foundation has a very large number of committees," Knapp said. "To my knowledge, there have been no political tests applied to any appointees to these committees."

"You would resist that?" Kennedy asked.

"Yes, I would, sir," Knapp replied.

Knapp was also drawn out on NSF's programs to encourage women and minorities to pursue scientific careers, a goal that the Senator strongly supported when a Democratic Senate majority gave him the chairmanship of the Health and Human Resources subcommittee concerned with NSF.

Knapp assured him that he, too, cherished that goal and that though specific programs for women minorities were being eased out in an internal reorganization that he has initiated at NSF, their interests would rank high in all programs for research and training.

Washington Sizes Up Knapp

At the six month-mark in his Washington tenure, Knapp evokes a fairly consistent appraisal from the oldtimers of science-policy, from Capitol Hill to the cubbyholes of the National Academy of Sciences and within the Foundation itself: Nice guy, professionally as well qualified for the job as any of his predecessors, and far better than some, earnest and determined to promote topflight science with the NSF budget—but also quite naive about Washington's ways.

Stanford Chief Riled by Indirect Costs Report

Donald Kennedy, President of Stanford University, has urged the leaders of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB) to crack down on the Federation's newsletter for irreverence toward big academe's pursuit of federal money.

In a crochety letter uncharacteristic of his cool-headed performance as Food and Drug Commissioner during the Carter Administration, Kennedy expressed his displeasure on March 15 to Mary J. Osborne, President of FASEB, and Robert W. Krauss, Executive Director. The object of his fulminations was the March issue of the FASEB newsletter, in which the position of academic administrators concerning indirect costs for research was subjected to light-hearted scorn.

The theme of the offending FASEB piece [as was briefly recounted in SGR Vol. XIII, No. 6] was that the Washington-based representatives of the big research universities are deliberately stonewalling NIH Director James B. Wyngaarden's attempts to restrain the growth of indirect-cost expenditures; it was further intimated that indirect costs have been rising at the expense of direct support for researchers, a group that predominates in the six societies through which 22,000 PhDs and MDs belong to FASEB. [SGR can vouch for the validity of these allegations, but, in the interest of objectivity, we stand aside.]

The Kennedy letter evoked no sympathy from the FASEB leadership, and is regarded with amusement by Walter Ellis, a retired Navy Captain who has written and edited the FASEB newsletter since 1974. But the letter is nonetheless worthy of public note as an example of the "don't-dare-disagree-with-me" arrogance that political Washington, to its distaste, has so often observed in academic chieftains as they clamor for federal funds.

Describing the newsletter article as "an extraordinarily divisive document," Kennedy states that its "tone... is so singularly and unpleasantly sarcastic that it would be thought a breach of common courtesy even between sworn Congressional enemies."

Science Board Honors Seitz

Frederick Seitz, former President of the National Academy of Sciences and of the Rockefeller University, has been named the fourth recipient of the Vannevar Bush Award, named in honor of the World War II research leader who conceived the National Science Foundation. The award, bestowed by the National Science Board, NSF's senior policymaking body, is intended as a recognition of scientific statesmanship. Seitz, who headed Rockefeller from 1968 until his retirement in 1978, will receive the award at the Science Board's annual dinner May 18 at the State Department.

Press Assails R&D Cuts

Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences, has departed from the speak-no-evil line that he's applied to the Reagan science policies over the past two years, and has chastised the Administration for savaging the Environmental Protection Agency, the Geological Survey, and the National Bureau of Standards.

In his annual report to the Academy, Press graded the Administration as "generally positive" in its support of research, but appended the apt observation that the fund increases proposed for fiscal 1984 came after a good deal of damage had been inflicted by cuts over the past two years. He also knocked the Administration for employing political loyalty criteria in science-related appointments.

And he goes on to advance the arguable proposition that "Most of the time and in most places, investigators know that their presidents and deans are trying to act in the best interests of academic work, and that their aims are much more likely to be convergent than in opposition....

"We need...mutual respect," Kennedy continues, "to sort this issue out sensibly or, failing that, to join forces in the next one. I hope you will agree that the language in your newsletter diminishes the prospects for that kind of understanding."

And he concludes with a karate chop to the First Amendment: "I find it a dreadful embarrassment to both sides in the present disagreement, and I hope you will consider putting a stop to it."—DSG

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report

Northwest Station

Box 6226A

Washington, D.C. 20015

Renew my subscription; Check enclosed

Enter my subscription; Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$132.50 ; two years, \$235.00

(Overseas airmail, \$25.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Indirect Costs, Part II: Campus-by-Campus Rates

Completing the list that we began last issue of research institutions and their indirect-cost rates for federally supported projects, the following are computed by the Department of Health and Human Services:

Case Western Reserve55.9
Harvard Medical94.1
Illinois Inst. of Tech60.1
Kansas Univ. Med. School25.1
N.Y. Medical College61.0
Northwestern48.0
Univ. of Connecticut HSC45.1
Univ. of Lowell74.9
Univ. of Maine47.8
Univ. of Mass. at Amherst45.0
Univ. of Mass. Med. School78.0
Univ. of Miami, Main Campus60.0
Univ. of Miami, Marine58.0
Univ. of Miami, Ohio36.7
Univ. of Michigan49.0
Univ. of Minnesota39.0
Univ. of Mississippi37.5
Univ. of Miss. Med Ctr33.8
Univ. of Montana42.0
Univ. of Nebraska at Omaha37.6
Univ. of Nebraska Med. School45.0
Univ. of Nevada, Reno40.0
Univ. of New Mexico37.0
Univ. of New Mexico Med. Ctr41.0
Univ. of New Orleans36.0
Univ. of North Carolina, Ch. Hill35.5
Univ. of North Dakota35.5
Univ. of Ohio36.6
Univ. of Oklahoma HSC40.0
Univ. of Oregon44.1
Univ. of Oregon HSC39.5
Univ. of Pennsylvania65.0
Univ. of Pittsburgh47.0
Univ. of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez56.8
Univ. of Puerto Rico, Med. Sc.21.6
Univ. of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras31.5
Univ. of S. Florida49.5
Univ. of Tenn. HSC50.4
Univ. of Southern California53.0
Univ. of Texas at Austin38.0
Univ. of Texas at El Paso35.0
Univ. of Texas Cancer Ctr. at Houston39.0
Univ. of Texas HSC at Dallas38.0
Univ. of Texas HSC at Houston40.0
Univ. of Texas Med. Br.35.0
Univ. of Texas, Dallas38.1
Univ. of Texas, HSC at San Antonio38.0

Univ. of Vermont44.2
Univ. of Virginia45.0
Univ. of Washington34.0
Univ. of Wyoming33.0
Univ. of Idaho39.5
Utah State Univ.35.0
Vanderbilt Univ.61.0
Virginia Polytechnic Inst.48.0
Washington State Univ.45.0
Washington Univ. at St. Louis51.0
West Virginia Univ.43.0
Western Michigan35.0
Yeshiva Univ.89.0

The rates for the following institutions were computed by the Office of Naval Research:

Brown Univ.65.0
Cornell Univ.49.3
California Inst. of Tech.53.0
Carnegie-Mellon Univ.55.0
Univ. of Alaska, Anchorage57.5
Univ. of Dayton50.1
Univ. of Illinois, Chicago50.0
Univ. of Hawaii41.0
Univ. of Denver72.0
Cornell Univ. Medical College48.0
Columbia Univ.69.7
Georgia Inst. of Tech.47.2
Massachusetts Inst. of Tech.58.0
New Mexico State Univ.59.0
Pennsylvania State Univ.41.2
Polytechnic Inst. of New York79.0
Syracuse Univ.59.0
Stevens Inst. of Tech.77.5
Univ. of San Diego50.5
Univ. of Rhode Island46.2
Univ. of Rochester70.0
Charles Stark Draper Lab.87.7
National Bureau of Economic Res.60.0
National Academy of Sciences63.0
Woods Hole Oceanographic Inst.31.5
Stanford Univ.69.0

New Delhi Science Aides

Add to SGR's March 15 listing of science counselors and attaches and other research-related personnel at US embassies: New Delhi—Dennis O. Johnson, Science Attaché and International Health Representative (who is based there, along with Science Counselor Robert Stella, who was listed). Address for both: Department of State, New Delhi, Washington, DC 20520.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

Xerox—University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor

MI 48106

9999

